

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 2 and 4-13 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider her rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

#### **Entry of Amendment**

Since the present Amendment is being submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination, it is submitted that entry of this Amendment and full consideration thereof is proper.

#### **Rejection Under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Takano (U.S. Patent 4,259,557) in view of Frank et al. (U.S. Patent 2,854,074). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 3. Applicant has rewritten claims 2, 4 and 8 in independent form and at the same time have revised these claims to now claim the fabrication method of forming the silver contact structure, rather than the contact structure itself. Accordingly, since the Examiner has previously noted that the method steps were not given any patentable weight because it was a product- by-process claim, Applicant submits that the steps are now proper and should be given patentable weight since the method itself is being claimed.

In the Takano reference, rectangular holes are made in the blade. However, the particular method of forming the rectangular holes is not described. Thus, Applicant submits that this reference does not show the two step stamping process using separate dies.

Likewise, the Frank et al. reference does not show this process since the contact and the hole in which it is placed are formed in the same motion in order to avoid the formation of oxides on the contact. Thus, there is no separate stamping step utilizing a different die. Thus, neither of these references nor their combination teach the two step stamping method as is presently claimed. Furthermore, there is no teaching in either reference to indicate that such a method would be obvious. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2, 4 and 8 are patentable over the combination of Takano and Frank et al.

Claims 5, 6 and 7 depend from claim 4 and claims 9-13 depend from claim 8. As such these dependent claims are also considered to be allowable. These claims further describe the particular dies having extended angles and non-circular cross sections. Accordingly, these claims are additionally allowable.

Application No. 10/802,749  
Amendment dated December 22, 2005  
First Preliminary Amendment


Docket No.: 2450-0656PUS1

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Dated: December 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant